



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,963	03/27/2007	Yoshiyuki Futagami	050841	3196
23850	7590	08/13/2008	EXAMINER	
KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP 1420 K Street, N.W. Suite 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20005				TRIEU, THERESA
3748		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
08/13/2008		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
				PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/561,963	FUTAGAMI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Theresa Trieu	3748	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 December 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/15/2007, 12/22/2005</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt and entry of Applicants' Preliminary Amendment filed on Dec. 22, 2005 is acknowledged.

Claims 3-5 have been amended. Claims 6-8 have been added. Thus, claims 1-8 are pending in this application.

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Drawings

3. Figure 4 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted

by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
5. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Hirooka et al. (Hirooka) (Patent Number 5,584,678).

Regarding claim 1, APA discloses a scroll compressor in which a scroll fixed lap 2a rising from a fixed plate 2b of a fixed scroll 2 and a scroll orbiting lap 4a rising from an orbiting plate 4b of an orbiting scroll are combined with each other to form compression chambers therebetween, a plate back surface of the orbiting scroll is provided with a back pressure space 8a, the back pressure space is divided into an inner region and an outer region by a seal ring 14, high pressure is applied to the inner region of the seal ring, pressure which is lower than that applied to the inner region is applied to the outer region, thereby bringing the orbiting scroll into contact with the fixed scroll, a rotation-resistant part 22 restrains the orbiting scroll from rotating, the orbiting scroll is allowed to orbit, thereby moving the compression chamber toward a center of scroll while reducing volume of the compression chamber, refrigerant gas is sucked into the compression chamber and compressed, wherein the fixed scroll is made of iron-based material, the orbiting scroll is made of aluminum- based material. However, APA fails to disclose at least the plate back surface of the orbiting scroll being subjected to surface processing.

Regarding claims 1 and 2, Hirooka teaches that it is conventional in the art to utilize at least the plate back surface of the orbiting scroll 14 is subjected to surface processing; any of alumite coating processing being carried out as the surface processing (col.5, line 59-61). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have utilized the plate surface of the orbiting being subjected to surface processing, as

taught by Hirooka in the APA apparatus, since the use thereof would have reduced the wear amount, improved the performance and the efficiency of the scroll compressor device.

6. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Hirooka, as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Yamada et al. (Yamada) (Patent Number 5,468,130).

The modified APA discloses the invention as recited above; however, the modified APA fails to disclose a sliding portion between the plate back surface and the seal ring being subjected to lapping processing, buff processing or barrel polishing processing after the surface processing. A product-by-process limitation and the determination of patentability in a product-by-process claim are based on the product itself, even though the claim may be limited and defined by the process. That is, the product in such a claim is unpatentable if it is the same as or obvious from the product of the prior art, even if the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695,697,227 USPQ 964,966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). A product-by-process limitation adds no patentable distinction to the claim, and is unpatentable if the claimed product is the same as a product of the prior art.

7. Claims 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Hirooka, as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Yamada et al. (Yamada) (Patent Number 5,468,130).

The modified APA discloses the invention as recited above; however, the modified APA fails to disclose a sliding portion between the plate back surface and the seal ring being masked and subjected to the surface processing. A product-by-process limitation and the determination of patentability in a product-by-process claim are based on the product itself, even though the

claim may be limited and defined by the process. That is, the product in such a claim is unpatentable if it is the same as or obvious from the product of the prior art, even if the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695,697,227 USPQ 964,966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). A product-by-process limitation adds no patentable distinction to the claim, and is unpatentable if the claimed product is the same as a product of the prior art.

8. Claims 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Hirooka, as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Yamada et al. (Yamada) (Patent Number 5,468,130).

The modified APA discloses the invention as recited above; however, the modified APA fails to disclose a sliding portion between the plate back surface and the seal ring being removed by working. A product-by-process limitation and the determination of patentability in a product-by-process claim are based on the product itself, even though the claim may be limited and defined by the process. That is, the product in such a claim is unpatentable if it is the same as or obvious from the product of the prior art, even if the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695,697,227 USPQ 964,966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). A product-by-process limitation adds no patentable distinction to the claim, and is unpatentable if the claimed product is the same as a product of the prior art.

Prior Art

9. The IDS (PTO-1449) filed on Oct. 15, 2007 and Dec.22, 2005 has been considered. An initialized copy is attached hereto.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure and consists of three patents: Takeuchi et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,573,390), Esumi

et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,302,665) and Nakayama et al. (Publication Number JP 08-144980), each further discloses a state of the art.

Conclusion

11. Applicant is duly reminded that a complete response must satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.111, including: "The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. A general allegation that the claims "define a patentable invention" without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. Moreover, "The prompt development of a clear Issue requires that the replies of the applicant meet the objections to and rejections of the claims." Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP §2163.06 II(A), MPEP §2163.06 and MPEP §714.02. The "disclosure" includes the claims, the specification and the drawings.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Theresa Trieu whose telephone number is 571-272-4868. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am- 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas E. Denion can be reached on 571-272-4859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TT
August 8, 2008

/Theresa Trieu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3748